

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested. In the first Office Action Claims 1-13 are pending in the case. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Canon in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,714,639 to Bedingfield, et al., in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,813,344 to Lemke. By way of this amendment, Applicant has cancelled claim 9.

Before responding in detail to the differences between the invention as now claimed and those disclosed in the references cited by the Examiner, it will be helpful to review the principal aspects of applicant's invention.

As the need to determine corresponding call origination data and geographic information e.g. city and state information, is continually expanding and quite vast, it is essential to store and update such data as efficiently as possible. This is particularly true in the present environment of cellular technology.

The present invention, as now defined in the claims, provides an improved decoding and processing system is provided for advanced determination and display of geographic information to a called party relating to the call origination party.

Accordingly, the improved system provides the user with convenient and efficient display of city and state caller identification that is capable of determining an ever increasing number of area code and local telephone exchange numbers.

Rejection of Claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a)

The Office Action rejected claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bedingfield in view of Lemke. The Office Action states that Bedingfield teaches an improved decoding and processing system for advanced determination and display of geographic caller information that includes the limitations of claim 1, but fails to include a mobile switching center. The Office Action states that Lemke teaches a method and system for providing information for identifying callers based on a partial phone number wherein the caller identification system can be integrated into a cellular phone (column 2, line 22 to column 3, line 9). The Office Action concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the cellular environment taught by Lemke into the system disclosed by Bedingfield. With regards to claims 2-6, the Office Action also states that Bedingfield teaches the improved system wherein the corresponding geographic information is a city, state, or country identification of the call origination party (column 8, lines 1-6).

Applicant respectfully submits that Bedingfield does not teach or suggest a server means for storage and retrieval of specific data from a data base library for selectively determining the corresponding geographic information of said CND message received from the call origination party. Applicant submits that Bedingfield is not directed toward the provision of selectively determined geographic information, but rather to the provision of calling name identification (CNAM) information (column 8, lines 3-6).

Applicant further submits that Lemke does not teach or suggest a mobile switching center or other mobile network elements, which are claimed in Applicant's invention. Lemke is directed solely to a device for reception of a signal from a telephone network along with further processing and does not include any suggestion that the device be combined with a mobile switch or any other network element.

In contrast to the features of the present invention, Lemke utilizes the entire phone number as the basis for the search, whereas the present invention is directed the search by way of specific parameters of area code and exchange.

Additionally, Lemke teaches a wild card search on variety of data sources, in contra-distinction to the present invention which recognizes the advantages of an exact match from

only one source.

Moreover, Lemke's search is terminated once the highest level match is found. If a full match is made, Lemke does not disclose a display of partial information (i.e., city and state).

Accordingly, Lemke's algorithm system searches through a variety of different data requiring relatively longer processing resources, which can adversely impact battery life.

Further, Lemke's wildcards could produce an erroneous result as it relies on user input information that may mask lower level verified database fields.

Bedingfield, Lemke and Applicant's claimed invention are structurally and functionally different in a way that eliminates any modification to combine the cited references to achieve Applicant's invention. In Bedingfield, the CNAM lookup occurs at a centrally located server shared by multiple carriers in a landline environment. In Lemke, information lookup occurs primarily at the mobile device in a wireless environment. In Applicant's claimed invention, geographic information lookup occurs at a server means located at the originating mobile carrier for the storage and retrieval of corresponding geographic information and is passed via wireless transmission to a mobile device. Absent impermissible reference to Applicant's claimed

invention, the Office Action provides no indication of how the claimed benefits of each respective reference could be combined to meet the limitation of Applicant's claimed invention.

Applicant further submits that Bedington does not contain any suggestion to combine the disclosed invention with a mobile environment. Applicant submits that Bedington is directed to the provision of calling name services in the context of local number portability (LNP), which applies only to a landline environment. Bedingfield fails to teach or suggest application to wireless number portability (WMP).

For the reasons discussed above, Applicant submits that independent claim 1 is allowable. Because claims 2-13 depend from an allowable claim, they are allowable for the same reason that makes their corresponding independent claim allowable.

Applicant submits that claims 4-6 are allowable for the following additional reasons. With respect to claim 4, Bedingfield does not teach or suggest the improved system wherein the corresponding geographic information is a country identification of the call origination party. With respect to claim 5, Bedingfield does not teach or suggest the improved system wherein the corresponding geographic information is a province identification of the call origination party. With respect to claim 6, Bedingfield does not teach or suggest the

improved system wherein the corresponding geographic information is displayed pictorially.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-8 and 10-13 of the pending application are in condition for allowance over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections, allowance and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

The undersigned further wishes to thank the Examiner for the helpful comments made during the course of the examination designed to advance the prosecution of the application.

Should the Examiner have any questions or require any additional information, it is requested that he contact the undersigned at the direct line phone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Frank Frisenda, Jr.', with a stylized, cursive script.

Frank Frisenda, Jr.
Registration No. 27,884

8275 So. Eastern Avenue
Suite 200
Las Vegas, Nevada 89123
Telephone: (702/792-3910)